

REMARKS

SUMMARY/ INTRODUCTORY COMMENTS:

The subject application sets forth active claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29, of which claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 are independent claims. Claims 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,373 (Apte et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,889 (Chan et al.).

Responses to the rejections summarized above are presently submitted in conjunction with amendments to prior claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Applicants submit that such amendment and response serves to overcome both the aforementioned rejections and otherwise places such application in condition for allowance.

If, after consideration of this paper, the Examiner does not agree in entirety with Applicants' reasoning in favor of patentability, Applicants respectfully request that the presently requested amendments to claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 still be entered because such amendments are offered to comply with matters of form brought forth in the April 21, 2005 Office Action so as to otherwise present rejected claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 in better form for appeal. Therefore, in accordance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116, Applicants respectfully request entry of the present amendments.

35 U.S.C. §112, FIRST PARAGRAPH, REJECTION (CLAIMS 6 AND 11):

Prior claim 6 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. More particularly, such claims are alleged as containing subject matter that was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventors, at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In response to the above characterization, present amendments to claims 6 and 11 revise the language of such claims to correspond more particularly with language set forth in the original specification. For example, claim 6 amended as presently

requested sets forth a method for providing interaction between a client and a server including the steps of automatically generating a bean and using the bean to provide interaction between a client and a server. The aspect of automatically generating a bean (such as a CORBA jellybean) is referenced several times in the subject application (e.g., step 53 in FIG. 4 and all steps of FIG. 5). Claim 6 also sets forth that the step of automatically generating a bean more particularly includes the steps of providing at least one property that a bean represents, providing a property field that describes the usage of an attribute for the bean, and providing a type that describes the bean. These more particular aspects of automatic generation of a bean are also described several times in the original specification, including in the original claims.

Applicants submit that the subject matter set forth in claims 6 and 11 amended as presently requested, without entry of any new matter, recites subject matter that is fully described in the specification. As such, withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, rejection is respectfully requested.

35 U.S.C. §103(a) REJECTION (CLAIMS 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29):

Prior claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,269,373 (Apte et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,836,889 (Chan et al.) Applicants respectfully traverse such rejection and request reconsideration of such alleged anticipation based on the following remarks.

Claim 1, amended as presently requested, is directed to a system for providing interaction between a client and a server, including in part means for automatically generating a bean. Claim 6, amended as presently requested, sets forth a method for providing interaction between a client and a server, including in part a step of automatically generating a bean. Claim 11, amended as presently requested, concerns a computer readable medium including logic for automatically generating a bean. Claim 16, amended as presently requested, includes an automatically generated bean.

As outlined above, each independent claim in the subject application sets forth features regarding the automatic generation of a bean in accordance with the present

subject matter. As described in the subject application with respect to Figs. 4 and 5, the automatic generation of beans (e.g., jellybeans) may include several detailed steps and features, including those outlined in the flow chart of Fig. 5. Automatic generation of such bean-related aspects helps provide a system and related method for client/server interaction that is quickly and easily configured as well as highly flexible and scanable.

The April 21, 2005 Office Action alleges that Apte et al., which is directed to a method and system for persisting beans as container-managed fields, disclose such automated bean generation. However, the beans in such a container-managed environment are not generated automatically as set forth in claims 1, 6, 11 and 16, amended as presently requested.

In contrast, the beans of Apte et al. are created in one of two ways:

- (1) by direct action of the client in which a “create” method is called on the bean’s home interface, or
- (2) by some other action that adds data to the database that the bean type represents (see col. 16, lines 40-45).

Even though for some beans (e.g., stateful session beans), a container can automatically save and retrieve a bean’s state in the process of managing instance pools of stateful session beans (see col. 16, lines 20-22), such automated feature does not concern or suggest the initial automatic generation of beans in accordance with present claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. As such, Applicants respectfully submit that Apte et al. fail to disclose or suggest all elements of present claims 1, 6, 11 and 16.

Applicants further submit that modification of the technology set forth in Apte et al. to provide for automatic generation of the beans would change the principle of operation of such reference. More particularly, the subject application sets forth that beans for containers are not generated automatically because they shall be implemented by an adaptor so they can be used in models (see original disclosure, page 5, lines 8-10). Since the beans disclosed in Apte et al. are for containers, then they are not generated automatically.

Applicants respectfully note that according to the guidance of §2143.01 of the

MPEP, a proposed modification cannot render the prior art unsatisfactory for its intended purpose or change the principle of operation of a reference.

Based on the present amendments and the above remarks, Applicants submit Apte et al. do not disclose or suggest all elements of present claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Furthermore, modification of such reference to include all elements of such claims would change the principle of operation of the reference. As such, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the alleged unpatentability of claims 1, 6, 11 and 16. Also, with regard to claims 2-3, 5, 7-8, 10, 12-13, 15, 17-18 and 20-29, such claims variously depend from otherwise allowable claims 1, 6, 11 and/or 16 and further limit same. As such, all pending claims in the subject application should be allowed and acknowledgement of the same is earnestly solicited.

CONCLUSION:

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicants respectfully submit that the present application, including claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-13, 15-18 and 20-29, as requested to be amended herewith, is in complete condition for issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance, and action to such effect is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at his convenience should only minor issues remain after consideration of this response in order to permit early resolution of same.

Respectfully submitted,

DORITY & MANNING,
ATTORNEYS AT LAW, P.A.

Date: July 21, 2005

Richard M. Moose
RICHARD M. MOOSE
Reg. No.: 31,226
Customer ID No.: 22827

Telephone: (864) 271-1592
Facsimile: (864) 233-7342